

### REMARKS

This Amendment and Request for Reconsideration is filed in response to the Office Action mailed on 19 June 2007 for the above-referenced patent application. In the present Amendment, claims 1, 4, 23, and 29, as well as withdrawn claim 14, have been amended; no claims have been canceled or added. The Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been entered by such amendment; the amended limitations are fully supported by the application as originally filed.

*In the Office Action of 19 June 2007, the Examiner maintained the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3-13 and 22-33. In response, the Applicant respectfully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowability of claims 3-13 and claims 22-33 and submit that the invention as defined by such claims should be broadly protected as warranted by law. Further, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the requirement for restriction and include claims 14-21 in the present application, and to further allow claims 14-21 as being further limiting than allowed claim 22.*

*In the same Office Action mailed on 19 June 2007, the Examiner again confirmed the restriction requirement associated with Group I claims 1-13 (method of making a read head) and Group II claims 14-21 (method of forming a read sensor for a magnetic head). In response, the Applicant further amends withdrawn independent claim 14 for better conformity and continues to disagree with the restriction requirement for reasons already provided.*

Again, withdrawn independent claim 14 as amended has limitations of substantially the same scope as (only narrower than) elected and allowed claim 22. See the Table below for comparison, where the strikethrough and underline in withdrawn claim 14 merely indicates a shifting of the claim language for better comparison with elected and allowed claim 22.

<b>Claim 22 (Elected/Allowed)</b>	<b>Claim 14 (Withdrawn)</b>
22. (Original) A method for use in making a read head, comprising:	14. (Withdrawn) A method for use in making a magnetic read head, comprising:
forming a read sensor which is abutted by longitudinal bias layers;	forming a plurality of read sensor layers over a wafer; forming a resist over the read sensor layers in a central region; with the resist in place: ion milling so that read sensor layers in side regions are removed to thereby form the read sensor in the central region; depositing the longitudinal layers in the side regions; <del>depositing a silicon layer over the longitudinal bias layers in the side regions;</del> removing the photoresist; and
selectively depositing lead layers over the longitudinal bias layers with use of a silicon reduction process and a hydrogen reduction process, the silicon reduction process comprising the further acts of:	selectively depositing lead layers over the longitudinal bias layers with use of a silicon reduction process and a hydrogen reduction process, wherein the silicon reduction process includes
depositing a silicon reactant layer over the longitudinal bias layers; and	<u>depositing a silicon reactant layer over the longitudinal bias layers in the side regions;</u>
passing a carrier gas which includes lead layer material so that the carrier gas is chemically reduced by the silicon.	passing a carrier gas which includes lead layer material so that the carrier gas is chemically reduced by the silicon.

As apparent, limitations of elected and allowed claim 22 and withdrawn claim 14 are substantially the same in many respects; the differences therein only relate to the narrower scope of withdrawn claim 14. Again, it makes no sense to maintain the restriction of claims 14-21.

Based on the above, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the requirement for restriction and include claims 14-21 as amended in the present

application, and to further allow claims 14-21 as being further limiting than allowed claim 22.

*In the same Office Action of 19 June 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Xiao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,291,087) in view of Nachtman (U.S. Patent No. 3,152,886). In response, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection of claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and submits that the claims as amended are allowable for at least the following reasons.*

For a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(1), the prior art in combination must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims. In addition, there must be some adequate reasons to combine the teachings of the different prior art references.

In the present case, the cited references in combination fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims. Specifically, the cited references in combination fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious the step of “*depositing lead layers selectively over the longitudinal bias layers, without a resist or other mask structure formed over the trackwidth region, and without depositing lead layers over the trackwidth region, using a silicon reduction process and a hydrogen reduction process.*”

In the Examiner’s argument with respect to such limitations, the Examiner states that “Xiao et al. disclose a method for use in making a read head, comprising ... without a resist formed depositing lead layers” with reference to the sequence Fig. 1 + 3 in Xiao et al. However, the Examiner’s rejection and argument fails. For one, the Applicants do not claim “without a resist formed depositing lead layers” as the Examiner argues, but actually claim “without a resist or other mask structure formed over the trackwidth region.” Therefore, the Examiner provides no reference or articulation in Xiao et al. for what is actually claimed. The prior art alone or in combination fail to teach “depositing lead layers selectively over the longitudinal bias layers, without a resist or other mask structure formed over the trackwidth region, and without depositing lead layers over the trackwidth region.” In addition, the Xiao et al. reference clearly teaches in FIG. 3 a deposition of lead layers 26a and 26b with a resist or stencil (i.e. one type of mask

structure) formed over the trackwidth region. Thus, not only does Xiao et al. fail to teach or suggest the actual limitations as claimed, but also teaches away from the actual limitations as claimed.

Further with respect to Nachtman, techniques for the reduction of metals are discussed but no teachings of selective deposition over particular locations of a read sensor structure without resist formation are disclosed. In addition, Nachtman does not teach the use of both a silicon reduction process and a hydrogen reduction process in the selective deposition of materials. With respect to this deficiency, Nachtman discusses that at least four direct methods “might” accomplish its stated desired to reduce molybdenite to metal: I. Thermal decomposition; II. Hydrogen reduction; III. Carbon reduction; and IV. Silicon reduction. See e.g. column 1 of Nachtman. However, Nachtman goes on to describe that the use of silicon reduction for such purposes is undesirable since “[h]owever, silicon reacts with molybdenum to form a refractory silicide. Carbon also forms a refractory carbide with molybdenum, and this method also is found wanting” (see e.g. column 1 at lines 42-43 of Nachtman). Thus, Nachtman does not teach the use of both silicon reduction process and hydrogen reduction process for the deposition of lead layers, but rather only that “sulfides of molybdenum may be subjected to direct reduction by lead or tin in a non-oxidizing atmosphere, as for example in the presence of a non-oxidizing gas, e.g., hydrogen, helium or argon, or mixtures thereof (see e.g. column 2 at lines 32-36 of Nachtman).

As apparent, Nachtman teaches away from use of a silicon reduction process for such purposes. The Examiner provides no counterargument or reasoning to the contrary. Thus, there is no adequate teaching, suggestion, or motivation with respect to the “selective deposition” step as recited to construct that which is claimed.

Since the prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations and render the invention obvious, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw all rejections of claims and allow the present application.

The Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment and reconsideration of all pending claims. The Applicants respectfully submit that the application as amended is now in a condition suitable for allowance.

Thank you. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if necessary to expedite allowance of the present application.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Oskorep', written over the printed name.

JOHN J. OSKOREP  
Reg. No. 41,234

Date: 18 October 2007

*JOHN J. OSKOREP, ESQ. LLC  
ONE MAGNIFICENT MILE CENTER  
980 NORTH MICHIGAN AVENUE, SUITE 1400  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 USA  
Telephone: (312) 222-1860 Fax: (312) 475-1850*